

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-37 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34 are amended. This amendment is supported by the specification at least Fig. 3 and paragraph [0009].

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Mr. Monjur Rahim at the personal interview held on February 18 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below, which constitute Applicant's record of the interview.

I. Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Office Action rejects claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard (U.S. Patent No. 7,245,725), and in view of England (U.S. Patent No. 7,137,004). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that Beard does not disclose or render obvious a method including at least the steps of receiving, with a first processor, data for use in an operation in a second processor, and verifying, with the first processor, a credibility of the data for the second processor by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source, as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claims 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34.

The Office Action, on pages 2 and 3, asserts that Beard discloses the features above recited in claim 1 (see col. 4, lines 26-36, and col. 5, lines 53-65 of Beard). Referring to Fig. 1 of Beard, Beard discloses two processors sharing common components implementing a header error correction (HEC) and cyclic redundancy check (CRC) mechanisms. The HEC/CRC are used to detect common errors caused by noise in transmission channels, but they are not capable of verifying a credibility of the data by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source. The

HEC/CRC are not suitable for protecting against intentional alteration of data because their mathematical properties make it easy to compute the HEC/CRC adjustment required to match any given change to the data. Thus, Beard fails to disclose or render obvious at least a method comprising verifying a credibility of the data by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34.

Further, according to Fig. 1 of Beard, even if a verifying mechanism is placed into where HEC/CRC is implemented, the verifying cannot be done by the first processor separately from the second processor; verifying can be done only by using the common components shared by the both processors. Therefore, Beard fails to disclose at least a method comprising verifying, with the first processor, for the second processor, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34.

Additionally, Beard discloses two communication processors used in asynchronous or synchronous, or master-slave mode of operations (see col. 4, lines 20-31, lines 54-59 of Beard). The processors are suitable to support simultaneous communications between multiple channels. The processors may communicate with one another. This only implies that each processor processes different data simultaneously, or one of the processors processes the data received by either one of the processors. However, this does not indicate that the data received by one of the processors is for use in an operation in another processor. Accordingly, Beard fails to disclose a method including at least the steps of receiving, with a first processor, data for use in an operation in a second processor, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 18, 24, 28 and 34.

At least in view of the above, Beard fails to disclose or render obvious at least receiving, with a first processor, data for use in an operation in a second processor, and verifying, with the

first processor, a credibility of the data for the second processor by validating that the data is sent from a trusted source, as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 18, 24, 28 and 34. England merely discloses a system in which an upgrade to a new trusted core or another application may be initiated in a trusted core if the new core is trusted. However, England fails to disclose the features above recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in claims 9, 18, 24, 28 and 34, and thus, does not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Beard.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully asserts that independent claims 1, 9, 18, 24, 28, and 34 are allowable. Claims 2-6 depend from claim 1; claims 10 and 12-17 depend from claim 9; claims 19-23 depend from claim 18; claims 25-27 depend from claim 24; claims 29-33 depend from claim 28; and claims 35-37 depend from claim 34, and are therefore also allowable by virtue of their dependence, as well as for the additional features that they recite. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-7, 9, 10 and 12-37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

II. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-7, 9, 10, and 12-37 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Andy N. Kim
Registration No. 61,050

JAO:ANK/mkg

Date: February 24, 2009

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--